

70



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/285,879	04/07/1999	YOSHIFUSA TOGAWA	614.1957	4256
21171	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			THAI, XUAN MARIAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/285,879

Applicant(s)

TOGAWA, YOSHIFUSA

Examiner

XUAN M. THAI

Art Unit

2111

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED May 20, 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____


Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-16 and 19-34.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


XUAN M. THAI
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2111

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented by applicants are deemed not to be persuasive. Applicants argued that Hernandez only discusses that various system components are powered down based on user or system inactivity, which is different from claim 1 which recites "detecting a type of data to be processed" and controlling "a corresponding one of the plurality of driving means according to the type of data to be processed." Further, in Hernandez, each PM handler 17 controls a device driver 15 based on a received power event. Contrary to Applicants' assertions, Hernandez discloses event manager which track (detect) [col. 3, lines 33-35] events (data to be processed) and distributes events to proper destinations as needed. The events (data to be processed) are processed by the PM handler 17 [col. 3, lines 42-43]. The PM handler 17 processes the event passed on to it from the event manager and determines whether the event received should effect its coupled device's power state [col. 3, lines 55-57]. Therefore, Hernandez clearly met the claimed limitations of "detecting a type of data to be processed" and controlling "corresponding one of the plurality of driving means according to the type of data to be processed." Hence, the arguments are deemed not to be persuasive. Applicants stated that the CPU 101 detects the type of the data of the file and writes the values to the power on/of flag 149 and the suspend/resume flag 150 in the register 148 according to the type of data of the file. Such limitation is not found in the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY